

[vixra.org](http://vixra.org) >

[Quantum Gravity  
and String  
Theory](#) >

viXra:1511.0037



## Quantum Gravity and String Theory



### Physical Review Letters Correspondence with Associate Editor

**Authors:** [Nigel B. Cook](#), [Stanley G. Brown](#)

Emails of more detailed discussion with the associate editor of Physical Review Letters on 22 January 2003 over the mechanism of gravity (see <http://vixra.org/abs/1305.0012> for brief summary or <http://vixra.org/abs/1111.0111> and related uploads to vixra for more detail). Once specious and otherwise false claims by Physical Review Letters are omitted, we are left with an email from the associate editor Richard Price which arrogantly and ignorantly declares: "You are proposing a very nonstandard mechanism for gravity ... Your mechanism/model is highly nonstandard and, as such, needs very thorough justification. Physical Review Letters is not the appropriate journal for such a presentation." This last sentence basically terminates any possibility of publishing the facts in the PRL, regardless of the thoroughness of the presentation, because they state that the journal is not the place for a scientific revolution based on proved facts.

**Comments:** 3 Pages.

**Download:** [PDF](#)

#### Submission history

[[v1](#)] 2015-11-03 16:41:11

**Unique-IP document downloads:** 0 times

#### Add your own feedback and questions here:

*You are equally welcome to be positive or negative about any paper but please be polite. If you are being critical you must mention at least one specific error, otherwise your comment will be deleted as unhelpful.*



Start the discussion...



**Nige Cook** • 4 minutes ago

Other information and video presentations are available totally free of charge at the website <http://quantumfieldtheory.org/>

^ | ▾ • Edit • Reply • Share ›



**Nige Cook** • 6 minutes ago

Please note that Stanley Brown's first response on 2 January 2003 was to claim that there was a fault in the presentation, see <http://vixra.org/abs/1511.0036> but as soon as I requested an objective assessment of precisely where his alleged fault was, and also offered to rewrite the paper to any presentation style he wanted, he then changed the goalposts and gets Richard Price to send a response in this email of 22 January 2003 stating that ANY presentation on the subject will automatically be rejected: "Your mechanism/model is highly nonstandard and, as such, needs very thorough justification. Physical Review Letters is not the appropriate journal for such a presentation." This is the kind of pseudoscientific subjective, anti-objective, attitude problem that causes stagnation in science. I still get some ignorant folk in journalism (TV, newspapers and magazines) ignorantly claiming that "peer" reviewed journals like PRL are the place to publish and get feedback for new, predictive methods in QFT. It's weird, because - again without reading or checking my paper - they will automatically side with the non-objective censorship of PRL as if the editor is the leader of a religious dogma to be worshipped regardless of what it says. The whole idea of journalism at least taking the underdog seriously in a struggle just to have the facts critically and seriously examined, is a joke. There is no serious interest, quite the opposite. There is strong hostility against innovation, dressed up in propaganda which claims the exact opposite. Similar attitude problems existed in

[Contact](#) - [Disclaimer](#) - [Privacy](#) - [Funding](#)